```
James C. Shah (SBN 260435)
    Scott R. Shepherd
    SHEPHERD, FINKELMAN, MILLER & SHAH, LLP
2
    401 West A Street, Suite 2350
    San Diego, CA 92101
3
    Telephone: (619) 235-2416
 4
    Facsimile: (619) 235-7334
    jshah@sfmslaw.com
5
    sshepherd@sfmslaw.com
 6
    CHIMICLES & TIKELLIS LLP
7
    Steven A. Schwartz
    Timothy N. Mathews
8
    361 W. Lancaster Avenue
    Haverford, PA 19041
    Telephone: (610) 642-8500
10
    Attorneys for Plaintiff and on Behalf
11
    of All Others Similarly Situated
12
                            UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13
                          NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14
15
    MICHAEL RODMAN, on behalf of himself ) Case No.: 3:11-cv-03003 JST (JCS)
16
    and all others similarly situated,
17
                  Plaintiff,
18
                                              ) PLAINTIFF'S ADMINISTRATIVE
          VS.
                                              ) MOTION REGARDING SEALING OF
19
    SAFEWAY, INC.,
                                              ) DOCUMENTS PURSUANT TO CIVIL
                                             ) LOCAL RULES 7-11 AND 79-5
20
                  Defendant
21
22
                                             ) Trial Date: None Set
                                             ) Judge: Hon. Jon S. Tigar
23
24
                                             ) Complaint filed: June 17, 2011
25
26
27
28
    H0029480.
                                                                  PLAINTIFF

S ADMINISTRATIVE
                                                               MOTION REGARDING SEALING OF
                                                               DOCUMENTS PURSUANT TO CIVIL
```

LOCAL RULES 7-11 AND 79-5 3:11-cv-03003 JST (JCS) 1 2

Pursuant to the Court October 4, 2013, Order Denying Administrative Motion to Seal (ÕOrderö) (Dkt. No. 118), Plaintiff Michael Rodman hereby submits this Administrative Motion Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, the Court Standing Order Governing Administrative Motions to File Under Seal, and the Stipulated Protective Order (ÕProtective Orderö) entered by the Court on August 6, 2012.

Plaintiff further notifies the Court that, pursuant to the Court of Order, he has re-lodged, conditionally under seal, Plaintiff Notice Of And Motion For Class Certification, the accompanying Memorandum Of Points And Authorities, the Declaration of Timothy N. Mathews, and certain exhibits thereto, as documents referencing information designated by Safeway as Confidential, pending the filing of a motion and declaration by Safeway. ¹

As an initial matter, Plaintiff states that no person or entity other than Safeway has designated any documents sought to be sealed as confidential.² Plaintiff states that he has reviewed and complied with the Courtes Standing Order Governing Administrative Motions to File Under Seal and Civil Local Rule 79-5.

The Court of Order encouraged the parties to stipulate as to a narrowly tailored sealing order, if possible. The parties have reached agreement as to sealing some, but not all, of the portions of the Memorandum and accompanying Exhibits.

To facilitate the Courton review, in addition to setting forth the relevant statements, documents, and portions of documents on which the parties agree and disagree in table form

Plaintiff has also re-filed non-confidential exhibits for the convenience of the Court.

The Declaration of Brian Blackman filed by Safeway in support of the prior administrative motion to seal indicated that Safeway did not assert confidentiality as to certain statements that had been redacted from Plaintiff® Memorandum in support of his Motion for Class Certification. See Dkt. No. 116, at ¶ 10. Based on paragraph 10 of Mr. Blackman® Declaration, the Court believed that some other party must have designated those statements confidential. See Order. In fact, Plaintiff redacted those statements because they were derived from documents that had been marked õHighly Confidentialö by Safeway. Upon review of Plaintiff® memorandum, however, Safeway determined that the statements themselves were not confidential, even though Safeway continues to assert Confidentiality as to all or portions of the underlying documents.

PLAINTIFF® ADMINISTRATIVE

below, the copies of Plaintiff

Motion, Memorandum, and Exhibits filed contemporaneously herewith are redacted (for public versions) or highlighted (for non-public versions) in two colors:

- (1) **Yellow** highlighting indicates those portions of documents which Safeway contends should be filed under seal, and which Plaintiff <u>stipulates</u> can be filed under seal; and
- (2) **Pink** highlighting indicates those portions of documents which Safeway contends should be filed under seal, but which Plaintiff <u>does not stipulate</u> are entitled to confidential treatment.

All highlighted portions (regardless of color) have been redacted from publicly filed versions.

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(d), Safeway will file a motion to seal and a declaration explaining why it believes the designated information is, in fact, confidential and sealable. In the event that Safeway fails to file a responsive declaration and motion as required within four (4) days after the conditionally sealed document is lodged with the Court, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 79-5(d), documents should be unsealed, filed, and made part of the public record.

This application is also based on the material set forth in the Declaration of Timothy N. Mathews Regarding Plaintiff® Administrative Motion To Seal Documents Pursuant To Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5 filed concurrently herewith.

The documents and portions of documents which the parties <u>agree</u> may be sealed (which are highlighted in yellow in the sealed and chambers copies) are as follows:

H0029480.

1		Document	Page/Line	
2		Memorandum of Law	Yellow redactions at:	
3			3:17-3:20;	
4			Note 3, first sentence;	
5			4:1-4:6 (ending at citation to Ex. F);	
6			4:10 (full sentence only);	
7			4:11-12 (first full sentence of paragraph);	
8			4:14-16;	
9			n. 4 (all but first sentence);	
10			5:6-8 (last sentence in paragraph);	
11			5:9-15;	
12			5:16-19 (excluding last sentence in	
13			paragraph);	
14			6:2-9 (beginning with second sentence of	
15			paragraph);	
16			6:16-19;	
17			n. 7, first two sentences only;	
18			7:1-2;	
19			n. 10;	
20			9:15-19;	
21			10:26-28 (last complete sentence);	
22			22:22 (highlighted phrase only);	
23			24:5-11 (two complete sentences on these	
24			lines).	
25		Exhibit A	Yellow redactions at:	
26			4:24-5:2;	
27			5:4-5:12;	
	i			

Case3:11-cv-03003-JST Document120 Filed10/11/13 Page5 of 12

1		5:14-16 (complete sentence only);
2		5:22-6:8.
3	Exhibit B	Yellow redactions at:
4		26:3-5;
5		26:7-8;
6		26:12-15;
7		29:14-18;
8		30:15-25
9		47:2-14;
10		47:16-18;
11		47:20-25;
12		48:1-8;
13		48:11-25;
14		132:14-25;
15		133:1-6;
16		133:8-25;
17		134:1;
18		134:4-25;
19		135:1;
20		135:7-20;
21		135:23-25;
22		143:1;
23		143:4-20;
24		143:24-25;
25		144:1;
26		144:5-13;
27		144:17-25;
28		

H0029480.

1			148:1-12;
2			148:15-24;
3			172:5-7;
4			172:13-17;
5			172:22-24
6			173:2-3
7			173:6-8;
8			173:11-23;
9			222:6-25;
10			303:1-3, and three words in 5;
11			303:8-25;
12			314:1-2;
13			314:10-25;
14			315:1-14.
15			
16		Exhibit E (no disputes)	Entire document
17		Exhibit F	Yellow redactions on pages 1-3
18		Exhibit G	Yellow redactions on pages 1-2
19		Exhibit H	Entire document
20		Exhibit I	Yellow redactions at 3:7-6:15
21		Exhibit J	Yellow redactions (which cover all but the
22			last two lines)
23		Exhibit K	Yellow redactions on attachment
24		Exhibit L (no disputes)	Redactions at 5:21-27; 7:6-8:11 and 9:12-14.
25		Exhibit M	Yellow redactions on attachment
26		Exhibit N	Yellow redactions on attachment
27		Exhibit O	Yellow redactions at:
	1		

28

1		39:2-11;
2		124:2-3;
3		124:16-25;
4		125:1-2;
5		125:5-17
6		126:5-25
7		241:1-25;
8		242:1-25
9		254:5-9;
10		255:21-25
11		256:1-22
12		275:20-25;
13		290:7-25.
14		
15	Exhibit P (no disputes)	Entire document
16	Exhibit Q	Yellow highlighted portions
17	Exhibit R	Yellow highlighted portions on
18	Exhibit U (no disputes)	Yellow redactions at:
19		5:24-27;
20		6:6;
21		6:11-16;
22		6:22-27;
23		7:5-8;
24		7:14-19
25		8:4-6;
26		8:18-20;
27		0.10-20,

9:6-8;

9:20-23;

10:9-13;

10:26-11:1;

11:21-26; and

Entire document

Entire document

Entire document

Yellow redactions at 40:8-15; 40:18-19;

40:23; 41:1-16; 42:10-12; 42:15-19; 42:21;

43:6-16; 43:19-22; 44:5-9; 44:12-16; 44:19-

25; 321:9-322:18; 322:24-323:8; and 323:10-

12:18-20.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	Exhibit V (no disputes)
9	Exhibit W (no disputes)
10	Exhibit X (no disputes)
11	Exhibit CC (no disputes)
12	Zimen e e (ne disputes)
13	
14	
15	
16	

The portions of documents on which the parties disagree fall into three general categories.

324:17.

First, Plaintiff disagrees that certain facts concerning Safewayøs pricing methodology are entitled to confidential treatment to the extent those facts have already been revealed in public filings in this action. *See e.g. Plascencia v. Lending 1st Mortg.*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47164, 6-7 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 28, 2013) (denying request to seal where the information has already been revealed publicly in other filings).

Second, Safewayøs business decisions in 2009 and 2010 are not entitled to confidential treatment, particularly to the extent those decisions were ultimately reflected in public-facing documents. *See e.g., Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., Ltd.*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 162943 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2012) (õSamsung has not explained, and the Court cannot see, how

H0029480.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

disclosure of the fact that Samsung once held such discussions could place it at any sort of competitive disadvantage now, in 2012, when the design decisions under discussion have presumably already been implemented in publically available products, or were rejected four years ago.ö)

Finally, general adjectives used to describe Safeways pricing program by Safeway.coms

CFO are not confidential.

The portions of documents which Plaintiff does <u>not agree</u> may be sealed are as follows:

Document	Page/Line		
Memorandum of Law	Pink redactions at:		
	4:6-10 (the complete sentence only);		
	4:12-13 (the complete sentence only);		
	4:17-20;		
	4:21-22;		
	5:1;		
	5:4-6 (complete sentence only);		
	6:10-12;		
	n. 7, last two sentences;		
	n. 8, last six words;		
	8:24 (two words);		
	n. 13, quoted phrase only;		
	19:26-28, beginning with the word		
	õrecognizedö		
Exhibit A	Pink redactions at:		
	4:15-23;		
	5:3-4 (first sentence);		
	5:13-14 (first sentence);		

H0029480.

1		5:16-21
2	Exhibit B	Pink redactions at:
3		26:16-25
4		27:4-15;
5		28:18-19;
6		29:5-7;
7		29:21-25;
8		30:1-14;
9		314:3-9.
10	Exhibit F	Pink highlighted sections on page 2
11	Exhibit G	Pink highlighted sections on page 1
12	Exhibit I	Response to Interrogatory 5
13	Exhibit J	Pink highlighted sections on last page (last
14		two lines)
15	Exhibit K	Pink highlighted sections on page 3 of
16		attachment
17	Exhibit M	Pink highlighted sections on page 3 of
18		attachment
19	Exhibit N	Pink highlighted section of email; and last
20		sentence on attachment
21	Exhibit O	Pink redactions at:
22		39:15-23;
23		48:13-25;
24		49:1;
25		123:9-19;
26		254:10-19;
27		255:12-20;
28		

Case3:11-cv-03003-JST Document120 Filed10/11/13 Page11 of 12

	271:11-12;
	271:21-23;
	272:1;
	272:21-24;
	273:2-15;
	274:3-25;
Exhibit Q	Pink highlighted portions
Exhibit R	Pink highlighted portion under õProblem
	Statementö

Plaintiff has filed herewith a proposed Order granting the administrative motion solely as to those portions of documents which he stipulates can be filed under seal. Defendant Safeway will file its own proposed Order pursuant to Rule 79-5.

H0029480.

PLAINTIFF

S ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION REGARDING SEALING OF DOCUMENTS PURSUANT TO CIVIL

3:11-cv-03003 JST (JCS)

Case3:11-cv-03003-JST Document120 Filed10/11/13 Page12 of 12

1	Dated: October 11, 2013		CHIMICLES & TIKELLIS, LLP
2	1	BY:	s/Timothy N. Mathews
3			Steven A. Schwartz (pro hac vice) Timothy N. Mathews (pro hac vice)
4			CHIMICLES & TIKELLIS, LLP
5			361 West Lancaster Avenue Haverford, PA 19041
6			Telephone: (610) 642-8500 Facsimile: (610) 649-3633
7			SteveSchwartz@chimicles.com TimothyMathews@chimicles.com
8			•
9			James C. Shah (SBN 260435) Scott R. Shepherd
10			SHEPHERD, FINKELMAN, MILLER & SHAH, LLP
11			35 E. State Street
12			Media, PA 19063 Telephone (610) 891-9880
13			Facsimile (610) 891-9883 jshah@sfmslaw.com
14			sshepherd@sfmslaw.com
15			Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27 28			
∠٥	H0029480.		PLAINTIFF & ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION REGARDING SEALING OF DOCUMENTS PURSUANT TO CIVIL

MOTION REGARDING SEALING OF DOCUMENTS PURSUANT TO CIVIL LOCAL RULES 7-11 AND 79-5 3:11-cv-03003 JST (JCS)